

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/529,217 | GUILLOT ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jehanne Souaya Sitton | 1634 | |

All Participants:

(1) Jehanne Souaya Sitton.

(2) Joseph Barrera.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 June 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 4, 11, 22

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner indicated that the amendment to claim 1 did not properly reflect the amended sections of the claims. the examiner also indicated that in claim 2, SEQ ID NO: 2 had been inadvertently dropped in the amendment filed DEC 6, 2001 as could be seen by the discrepancy between the marked up version and the "clean" version of the claims. Additionally, the examiner indicated that claims 2, 4, and 11 should be amended to clarify the SEQ ID NOS in the claims and the solution in claim 11. Additionally, the examiner indicated that the "such as" language in claim 22 was unnecessary since examples were provided in the specification. Applicant's attorney agreed to the changes in the attached examiner's amendment..